Attachment B: FY 2014-15 CCHE Criteria and Scoring Method

 General Fund, Capital Construction Fund, Federal Fund and Cash Fund Impact 	Projects that are partially funded projects by cash funds and federal funds will receive greater priority	/15
--	---	-----

Concerns:

 There was no good way to quantify this one as there are many variables (it is based on total cost, state fund request and cash funds contributed. Staff looked at all the projects and tried to give projects that were similar in cost and fund break down the same number of points.

2) Significant Health, Life Safety, and	Projects with clear and urgent life or safety implications	/10
Code Issues		710

Scoring:

No issues: 0 pointsMinor issues: 2 points

Similar to Level 3 Controlled Maintenance: 4 points
 Similar to Level 2 Controlled Maintenance: 6 points
 Similar to Level 1 Controlled Maintenance: 8 points

o Greater than Level 1/lowest Facility Condition Index (FCI) score: 10 points

3) Continuation Project	Request is a continuation project appropriated in FY13-14	/10
-------------------------	---	-----

• Scoring:

- Appropriated was considered a Capital Construction Fund appropriation that was in the Long Bill; Previous cash put into the project was considered, but did not receive as many points.
- o No previous funds: 0 points

FML project: 4 pointsDesign funded: 5 points

Actual construction funded: 8 points

4) Other Fund Sources	Other fund sources include projects that are funded partly by	/8
	non-state funds and non-student fee funds	

Concerns

- Questions about whether an institution should be able to pledge these funds or if they must be "in hand" for CCHE to consider the cash funds.
- Should prior year cash funds count the same as current or out year? Does it matter if the project was originally approved and funded under a two-year cash list?

Scoring:

- No cash/federal funds: 0 points
- o Prior year cash/federal funds: 2 points
- o Cash contribution 1%-9% of total funds requested: 3 points
- o Cash contribution 10%-19% of total funds requested: 4 points
- Cash contribution 20%-29% of total funds requested: 5 points
- Cash contribution 30%-39% of total funds requested: 6 points
- Cash contribution 40%-50% of total funds requested: 7 points
- o Cash contribution >50% of total funds requested: 8 points

5) Space Needs Analysis	Space needs analysis reflects how much space the institution or department has in its inventory, justification on how well the space needs are filled by the request, and how much space it needs based on the Master Plan, FTE projections, or Student enrollment projections	/8
-------------------------	--	----

Scoring:

- o O points: No space needs/Capital Renewal
- o 5 points: Programmatic space needs, not necessarily shortage of space
- o 6 points: Large space needs, but not as pressing. Doesn't cause waiting lists for programs. Does not affect general population but specific programs.
- o 7 points: Massive space needs (usually including waiting lists or "bottleneck" programs) that affect the general population (AHEC library, Mines Meyer Hall)
- o 8 points: Waiting lists in place for courses due to space and affects health care related fields

	The request must clearly identify the individuals that will be	
6) Clear Identification of Beneficiaries	served and how they will be better served by the project	/8
	requested	

• Scoring:

2 points: Affects mostly faculty
 4 points: Affects some students
 6 points: Affects most students
 8 points: Affects whole campus

7) Phase-able Projects	Phases must be stand-alone projects	/6

• Scoring:

- o 0 points: One phase, could probably be broken down
- o 2 points: Not possible to phase (nature of project or small CCF request)
- o 4 points: Broken down 2 phases a design phase (small amount) and a construction phase (large out- year requests)
- o 6 points: 2 phases with smaller out-year requests or 3 or more phases.

8) Achieves Goals	Integral to Achieving Statewide Policy Goals/Integral to	/5
b) Actileves douts	Institutional Planning Goals	75

• Scoring:

- o 0 points: Does not articulate any goals that are met
- 1 points: Missing four
- o 2 points: Missing three
- o 3 points: Missing two
- 4 points: Missing one
- o 5 points: Meets goals/aligns with:
 - Higher Education Master Plan,
 - State Goals and Needs,
 - Institutional Facilities Master Plan,
 - Institutional Strategic Plan, and
 - 5 year needs list

9) Program Plans	Projects will be review against the program plans for appropriateness, necessity, and sufficiency of the project with respect to institution programs, applicable state policies, plans, and standards	/5
------------------	--	----

• Concerns:

There was not a good way to quantify this one as there are many variables (it is based the degree to which the program plan integrates into facilities master plan, addresses needs articulated in master plan, best "bang for buck" of state dollars, alternatives addressed, conforms to CCHE format etc.). Staff looked at these criteria as an overview of the project.

10) Governing Board Priority	Projects will be prioritized based upon the priority the governing board has assigned to each project.	/20
------------------------------	--	-----

Concerns:

o Issues with this included requesting more weight be given to second and third priority of a system (especially CCCS) since they have more students, buildings and presumably, more capital needs than smaller institutions.

• Scoring:

- o 0 points: higher than sixth on governing board priority
- o 2 points: sixth governing board priority
- o 4 points: fifth governing board priority for large system
- o 6 points: forth governing board priority for large system
- o 8 points: third governing board priority for large system
- o 10 points: second governing board priority for small institution (CMU, CSM) or third priority for a large system
- o 15 points: second governing board priority for large systems (CU, CSU, CCCS)
- o 20 points: first governing board priority